

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/823,272 Examiner Yubin Hung	SHIN ET AL. Art Unit 2625

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Yubin Hung.

(3) Chid Iyer.

(2) Wenpeng Chen.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 30 November 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 2, 3

Identification of prior art discussed: Kothuri et al. (6,381,605)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See below

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)


THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

* Applicant's representative discussed claims 1-3 with regard to Kothuri ('605). Examiner Hung presented his interpretation of claim 1 and explained his response with regard to claims 1-3. Examiner maintains his position as set forth in the final rejection.


BHAVESH M. MEHTA

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: This must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Gulft H. Iyer
Examiner's signature, if required